



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,355	04/06/2000	James A. McKeith	MPATENT.164A	8050

20995 7590 04/04/2003

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

HU, JINSONG

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DP

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/544,355	MCKEETH, JAMES A. <i>(P)</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jinsong Hu	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2000.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are presented for examination.
2. Claim 22 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a improper dependent claim. A dependent claim should refer back to and further limiting another preceding claim [i.e., claim 22 can not depend on claim 23]. Correction is required.
3. Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood.

i. As per claim 10, line 14, it is unclear which client "the client" refers to [i.e., the first client or the second client].

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronen (US 6,026,411) in view of Morton (US 6,480,484 B2).

6. As per claim 1, Ronen teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of communication between a first client and a second client in a client-server network [col. 1, lines 7-10] the method comprising:

identifying the second client with a first identifier of the second client [202, Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 3-10; col. 4, lines 9-11];

determining, based on the first identifier of the second client, a second identifier of the second client [203, Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 10-13; col. 4, lines 11-14];

establishing, based on the second identifier of the second client, a communication link between the first client and the second client if the second client is connected to the network [205, 207, 208, Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 13-17 & lines 21-25; col. 4, lines 17-23].

7. Additionally, Ronen teaches the step of informing the first client that the second client is not on-line based on the second identifier of the second client [205, 206, Fig. 2]. Ronen does not specifically teach the step of establishing a communication link between the first client and the interactive file of the second client if the second client is disconnected from the network.

8. Morton on the other hand teaches the step of establishing a communication link between the first client and the interactive file of the second client if the

second client is disconnected from the network [col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7; col. 2, lines 33-56]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ronen and Morton because doing so would take advantage of the full capabilities provided by network technologies [Morton, col. 1, lines 44-45] by allowing the first client to obtain information about the second client even the second client is off-line. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ronen's system with Morton's interactive file link step to improve the functional ability of the system.

9. As per claim 2, Ronen teaches the step of determining the second identifier includes determining a network address of the second client based on a name of the second client [202, Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 3-10].

10. As per claim 3, Ronen teaches the step of communicating a name of the second client to a domain name system (DNS) server, and obtaining an Internet protocol (IP) address of the second client from the DNS server [203, Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 10-13; col. 4, lines 11-14].

11. As per claim 4, Ronen teaches the step of updating the DNS server with a current IP address of the second client, the IP address being identifiable by the domain name of the second client [col. 4, lines 45-49 & 55-57].

Art Unit: 2154

12. As per claim 5, Ronen and Morton teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Both references do not specifically teach the step of temporarily redirecting DNS service of the DNS server to another DNS server when updating the DNS server. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to redirect DNS service when updating the DNS server because doing so would limit any inconvenience for client by continuing providing service to the client even when the system is loading the new data. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the combination system of Ronen/Morton to bring convenience to client.

13. As per claims 6 and 7, Ronen and Morton teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. However, both references do not specifically teach the step of monitoring arrival of a signal that indicates the second client is on/off line. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ronen and Morton because doing so would save the time for the first client by letting the first client being notified once the second client is at on-line status. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the combination system of Ronen/Morton to make the communication between clients less time consume.

14. As per claims 8 and 9, Ronen teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Ronen does not specifically teach the step of establishing a

Art Unit: 2154

communication link between the first client and the interactive file includes accessing a Web page that is configured to provide information to the first client and allow the first client to leave a message to the second client.

15. Morton on the other hand teaches the step of establishing a communication link between the first client and the interactive file includes accessing a Web page that is configured to provide information to the first client and allow the first client to leave a message to the second client [col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7; col. 2, lines 33-56]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ronen and Morton because doing so would take advantage of the full capabilities provided by network technologies [Morton, col. 1, lines 44-45] by allowing the first client to communicate with the second client even the second client is off-line. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ronen's system with Morton's interactive file link step to improve the functional ability of the system.

16. As per claims 10-18, since they introduce the same limitations as claims 1-9 from two different perspectives [i.e., the first client and the second client, respectively], they are rejected under the same basis as claims 1-9.

17. As per claims 19-24, since they are system claims of claims 1-9, they are rejected under the same basis as claims 1-9.

18. As per claims 25 and 26, Ronen teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method of communication between a first client and a second client in a client-server computer network [col. 1, lines 7-11] the method comprising:

accepting a request for communication with the first client via the network based, at least in part, on identifying the second client by an identifier that is equivalent to a network address of the second client [201-204, Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 3-17; col. 4, lines 17-22];

establishing, based on the network address of the second client, a communication link between the first client and the second client if the second client is connected to the network [208, Fig. 2; col. 21-25; col. 4, lines 21-23].

19. Additionally, Ronen teaches the step of informing the first client that the second client is not on-line based on the second identifier of the second client [205, 206, Fig. 2]. Ronen does not specifically teach establishing a communication link between the first client and the interactive file of the second client if the second client is disconnected from the network.

20. Morton on the other hand teaches the step of establishing a communication link between the first client and the interactive file of the second client if the second client is disconnected from the network [col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7; col. 2, lines 33-56]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ronen and

Morton because doing so would take advantage of the full capabilities provided by network technologies [Morton, col. 1, lines 44-45] by allowing the first client to obtain information about the second client even the second client is off-line. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Ronen's system with Morton's interactive file link step to improve the functional ability of the system.

21. As per claims 27 and 28, since they introduce the same limitations as claims 25-26 from two different perspectives [i.e., the first client and the second client, respectively], they are rejected under the same basis as claims 25-26.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Hutton et al. (US 6,108,704) discloses a method for point-to-point protocol exchanging; and

Peacock (US 6,381,650 B1) discloses a method for locating a dynamic address.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306 – 5932.

Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-9052. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follow:

Official Faxes: (703) 746-7239

After Final Responses: (703) 746-7238

Draft Responses: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-3900.

Jinsong Hu

March 31, 2003


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER